

REMARKS

Upon entry of the amendment, claims 5, 8-9, 11-16, 20 and 23 are all the claims pending in the application. Claim 5 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 21-22 and based on, for example, page 35 of the specification. Claim 8 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 17-19 and based on, for example, page 35 of the specification.

Claims 17-19 and 21-22 have been canceled.

In addition, claim 20 has been amended to depend from claim 8 instead of canceled claim 17.

Applicants respectfully submit that with the entry of the proposed amendments, the present application will be in condition for allowance. Since the amendments raise no new issues, entry of the above amendments is respectfully requested.

I. Response to Rejection of Claims 5, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5, 8 and 9 are still rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Suzuura et al. (US Patent No. 6,066,404).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Examiner asserts that “carrying member” broadly covers the protective layer 6 in, for example, Fig. 4. It is respectfully submitted that the protective layer 6 of Suzuura is not a semiconductor wafer or a base for a flat panel display, and thus, Suzuura fails to teach or suggest every element of claims 5 and 8. Accordingly, Suzuura does not render obvious the present invention according to claims 5, 8 and 9.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Response to Rejection of Claims 5, 8-9, 17-19, and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 5, 8-9, 17-19 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Namikawa et al. (WO 01/94036).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 5 and 8 recite a releasable protective film that is a polyolefin-based film comprising polyethylene, polypropylene, polybutene, polybutadiene or polymethylpentene. In this regard, the Examiner relies on the disclosure at page 5, lines 14-17. However, the Examiner's reliance upon page 5, lines 14-17 is misplaced. The disclosure at page 5, lines 14-17 relate to the *cleaning layer* and not the releasable protective film.

Thus, although Namikawa discloses that the cleaning layer can be a plastic, such as polyethylene or polypropylene, Namikawa does not disclose a releasable protective film of the claimed materials. Accordingly, Namikawa fails to teach or suggest every element of claims 5 and 8 since it does not disclose a releasable protective film that is a polyolefin-based film comprising polyethylene, polypropylene, polybutene, polybutadiene or polymethylpentene.

Hence, Namikawa does not render the present invention according to claims 5 and 8 obvious.

Furthermore, Example 1 and Comparative Example 1 were discussed in the previous Amendment to show that the cleaning layer of Namikawa would not necessarily possess the claimed relative intensities of the claimed fragment ions, which is a separate issue from unexpected results.

Although Example 1 and Comparative Example 1 do not have a polyimide cleaning layer, the difference in the materials of the releasable protective film results in different relative intensities of the claimed fragment ions and that Example 1 and Comparative Example 1

supports this position because Example 1 uses polypropylene while Comparative Example 1 uses polyester (which is what is used in Namikawa). Thus, when a polyester releasable protective film is used, the claimed relative intensities of the claimed fragment ions is not necessarily obtained. Accordingly, the comparison is not discussed to show the unexpected results but to show that since differences in protective film results in different relative intensities of the claimed fragment ions, one of ordinary skill in the art would not expect the cleaning layer of Namikawa to possess the claimed features.

In view of the above, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Response to Rejection of Claims 20 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Namikawa as applied to the above claims, and further in view of Terada et al. (WO 03/052045).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

It is submitted that claims 20 and 23 depend from claims 8 and 5, respectively. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as claims 5 and 8.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of claims 5, 8-9, 11-16, 20 and 23 is respectfully requested.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Keiko K. Takagi
Registration No. 47,121

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 23, 2008